REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed March 17, 2009. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 41 – 78 remain pending. In particular, Applicants amend claims 41, 46, 52, 57, 63, 68, and 74. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiners Keehn and Barqadle spent with Applicants' Attorney, Anthony Bonner, during a telephone discussion on June 4, 2009 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During that conversation, Examiner Keehn and Mr. Bonner discussed potential arguments and amendments with regard to claim 1, in view of *Moroz*. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner Keehn carefully consider this response and the amendments.

II. Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 46, 57, 68, and 74 for various informalities. Applicants amend claims 46, 57, 68, and 74, as indicated above and submit that these amendments overcome this objection.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claim 41 is Allowable Over *Microsoft, Brownell,* and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of Non-Patent Literature from Brownell and Machek on USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason

that *Microsoft* in view of *Brownell* and *Moroz* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 41. More specifically, claim 41 recites:

> A method for coupling a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both a remote network drive interface specification and a non-network drive interface specification, the method performed by a network adapter, the method, comprising:
>
> providing a plurality of universal serial bus configurations to a universal serial bus network;
>
> receiving a first request from a host, the host coupled to a device;
>
> returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration from the network the remote network drive interface specification configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform;
>
> ***determining whether an other configuration is supported, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform;***
>
> ***receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of support of the other configuration;***
>
> returning a non-remote network drive interface specification configuration, where the host is configured to parse the received configuration to determine the configuration supported by the device and where the host is configured to select a configuration that matches a client driver.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 41 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Brownell*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "method for coupling a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both a remote network drive interface specification and a non-network drive interface specification, the method performed by a network adapter, the method, comprising... ***determining whether an other configuration is supported, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform...*** [and] ***receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of support of the other configuration***" as recited in claim 41. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "[r]emote NDIS is a simple extension of well-understood and time-tested NDIS architecture" (page 1, line 43) and its use on a Windows® platform. However, nowhere does *Microsoft* suggest "***determining whether an***

other configuration is supported, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform... [and] *receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of support of the other configuration*" as recited in claim 41.

Additionally, *Brownwell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, *Brownwell* discloses a program for "'USB networking', connecting USB hosts as peers" (page 1, line 21). However, *Brownwell* fails to suggest "*determining whether an other configuration is supported, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*... [and] *receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of support of the other configuration*" as recited in claim 41.

Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Brownwell*. More specifically, *Moroz* discloses a "universal docking station for connecting a portable computer to a plurality of peripheral devices" (page 1, paragraph [0007]). However, this is completely different than "*determining whether an other configuration is supported, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*... [and] *receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of support of the other configuration*" as recited in claim 41. For at least these reasons, claim 41 is allowable.

B.   Claim 46 is Allowable Over *Microsoft, Brownell,* and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of Non-Patent Literature from Brownell and Machek on USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Brownell* and *Moroz* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 46. More specifically, claim 46 recites:

A method, at a host, for coupling universal serial bus devices network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising the steps of:

detecting a network device, the network device operating on a first configuration, the first configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform;

issuing a universal serial bus reset to the network device;

sending the reset to the network device for resetting the state of the network device;

issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform;

issuing a first descriptor request enabling a retrieval of device descriptors from the network device;

returning a device descriptor indicating a function of the network device; and

issuing configuration commands, whereby, the network device is configured to return a list of descriptors, wherein in response to a determination that at least one of the descriptors indicates multiple supported configurations, a second descriptor request is issued.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 46 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Brownell*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "method, at a host, for coupling universal serial bus devices network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising the steps of… *detecting a network device, the network device operating on a first configuration, the first configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform…* [and] *issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*" as recited in claim 46. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "[r]emote NDIS is a simple extension of well-understood and time-tested NDIS architecture" (page 1, line 43) and its use on a Windows® platform. However, nowhere does *Microsoft* suggest "*detecting a network device, the network device operating on a first configuration, the first configuration being configured*

15

to operate with a computing platform… [and] *issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*" as recited in claim 46.

Additionally, *Brownwell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, *Brownwell* discloses a program for "'USB networking', connecting USB hosts as peers" (page 1, line 21). However, *Brownwell* fails to suggest "*detecting a network device, the network device operating on a first configuration, the first configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform*… [and] *issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*" as recited in claim 46.

Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Brownwell*. More specifically, *Moroz* discloses a "universal docking station for connecting a portable computer to a plurality of peripheral devices" (page 1, paragraph [0007]). However, this is completely different than "*detecting a network device, the network device operating on a first configuration, the first configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform*… [and] *issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*" as recited in claim 46. For at least these reasons, claim 46 is allowable.

C. Claim 52 is Allowable Over *Microsoft, Brownell,* and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 52 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote

NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of Non-Patent Literature from

Brownell and Machek on USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*") and U.S. Publication Number

2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason

that *Microsoft* in view of *Brownell* and *Moroz* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the

elements of claim 52. More specifically, claim 52 recites:

> An apparatus for coupling universal serial bus devices network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising:
> a universal serial bus network configured to receive a plurality of universal serial bus configurations;
> a receiving component configured to receive a first request from a network adapter;
> a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration, **the remote network drive interface specification configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform, the network adapter receiving a second request from a host, when there is an indication of support of an other configuration, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform**;
> a parsing component for parsing all the received configuration to determine the configuration supported by the device; and
> wherein the host selects the configuration that matches a client driver.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 52 is allowable over the cited art for at least the

reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Brownell*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses,

teaches, or suggests an "apparatus for coupling universal serial bus devices network adapter

supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface

specification, comprising… a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface

specification configuration, **the remote network drive interface specification configuration**

being configured to operate with a computing platform, the network adapter receiving a

second request from a host, when there is an indication of support of an other

configuration, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform"

as recited in claim 52. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "[r]emote NDIS is a simple extension of well-understood and time-tested NDIS architecture" (page 1, line 43) and its use on a Windows® platform. However, nowhere does *Microsoft* suggest "a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration, **the remote network drive interface specification configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform, the network adapter receiving a second request from a host, when there is an indication of support of an other configuration, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform**" as recited in claim 52.

Additionally, *Brownwell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, *Brownwell* discloses a program for "'USB networking', connecting USB hosts as peers" (page 1, line 21). However, *Brownwell* fails to suggest "a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration, **the remote network drive interface specification configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform, the network adapter receiving a second request from a host, when there is an indication of support of an other configuration, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform**" as recited in claim 52.

Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Brownwell*. More specifically, *Moroz* discloses a "universal docking station for connecting a portable computer to a plurality of peripheral devices" (page 1, paragraph [0007]). However, this is completely different than "a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration, **the remote network drive interface specification configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform, the network adapter receiving a second request from a host, when there is an indication of support of an other configuration, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform**" as recited in claim 52. For at least these reasons, claim 52 is allowable.

18

D.   Claim 57 is Allowable Over *Microsoft, Brownell,* and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 57 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" (*"Microsoft"*), and further in view of Non-Patent Literature from Brownell and Machek on USB Host to Host Links (*"Brownell"*) and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 (*"Moroz"*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Brownell* and *Moroz* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 57. More specifically, claim 57 recites:

> An apparatus for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising:
> a detecting component configured to detect a network device communicating via a first configuration, **the first configuration being configured to operate with a first computing platform**, and for issuing a universal serial bus reset to a network device by a host, and resetting a state of the network device, and for receiving a network device at a universal serial bus port;
> a first issuing component configured to issue a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus via a second configuration;
> a second issuing component configured to issue a first descriptor request for retrieving device descriptors from the network device; and
> a third issuing component configured to issue configuration commands, whereby, the network device returns a list of descriptors, wherein in response to a determination that at least one of the descriptors indicates that an other configuration is supported, **the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform, a second descriptor request is issued**.
> **(Emphasis added).**

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 57 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft, Brownell,* and *Moroz,* taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests an "apparatus for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising… a detecting component configured to detect a network device

19

communicating via a first configuration, *the first configuration being configured to operate*

with a first computing platform… [and] a third issuing component configured to issue

configuration commands, whereby, the network device returns a list of descriptors, wherein in

response to a determination that at least one of the descriptors indicates that an other

configuration is supported, *the other configuration being incompatible with the computing*

platform, a second descriptor request is issued" as recited in claim 57. More specifically,

Microsoft discloses "[r]emote NDIS is a simple extension of well-understood and time-tested

NDIS architecture" (page 1, line 43) and its use on a Windows® platform. However, nowhere

does *Microsoft* suggest "a detecting component configured to detect a network device

communicating via a first configuration, *the first configuration being configured to operate*

with a first computing platform… [and] a third issuing component configured to issue

configuration commands, whereby, the network device returns a list of descriptors, wherein in

response to a determination that at least one of the descriptors indicates that an other

configuration is supported, *the other configuration being incompatible with the computing*

platform, a second descriptor request is issued" as recited in claim 57.

Additionally, *Brownwell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically,

Brownwell discloses a program for "'USB networking', connecting USB hosts as peers" (page 1,

line 21). However, *Brownwell* fails to suggest "a detecting component configured to detect a

network device communicating via a first configuration, *the first configuration being*

configured to operate with a first computing platform… [and] a third issuing component

configured to issue configuration commands, whereby, the network device returns a list of

descriptors, wherein in response to a determination that at least one of the descriptors indicates

that an other configuration is supported, *the other configuration being incompatible with the*

computing platform, a second descriptor request is issued" as recited in claim 57.

Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Brownwell*. More

specifically, *Moroz* discloses a "universal docking station for connecting a portable computer to

a plurality of peripheral devices" (page 1, paragraph [0007]). However, this is completely

different than "a detecting component configured to detect a network device communicating via

a first configuration, **the first configuration being configured to operate with a first**

computing platform... [and] a third issuing component configured to issue configuration

commands, whereby, the network device returns a list of descriptors, wherein in response to a

determination that at least one of the descriptors indicates that an other configuration is

supported, **the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform, a**

second descriptor request is issued" as recited in claim 57. For at least these reasons, claim

57 is allowable.

E.   Claim 63 is Allowable Over *Microsoft, Brownell,* and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 63 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote

NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of Non-Patent Literature from

Brownell and Machek on USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*") and U.S. Publication Number

2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason

that *Microsoft* in view of *Brownell* and *Moroz* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the

elements of claim 63. More specifically, claim 63 recites:

> A system for attaching a universal serial bus network
> adapter supporting both remote network drive interface
> specification and non-network drive interface specification,
> comprising:
> a providing component configured to provide two universal
> serial bus configurations to a universal serial bus network;
> a first receiving component configured to receive a first
> request from a host;
> a first returning component configured to return a remote
> network drive interface specification configuration that is
> **configured to operate with a computing platform from the**
> **network adapter;**
> a second receiving component configured to receive a
> second request from a host, **when there is an indication that an**

other configuration that is incompatible with the computing platform is supported;

a second returning component configured to return a non-remote network drive interface specification configuration from the network adapter;

a parsing component configured to parse all the received configuration to determine the configuration supported by the device; and

a selecting component configured to select a configuration that matches a client driver.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 63 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Brownell*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "system for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising… a first returning component configured to return a remote network drive interface specification configuration that is *configured to operate with a computing platform from the network adapter*… [and] a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, *when there is an indication that an other configuration that is incompatible with the computing platform is supported*" as recited in claim 63. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "[r]emote NDIS is a simple extension of well-understood and time-tested NDIS architecture" (page 1, line 43) and its use on a Windows® platform. However, nowhere does *Microsoft* suggest "a first returning component configured to return a remote network drive interface specification configuration that is *configured to operate with a computing platform from the network adapter*… [and] a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, *when there is an indication that an other configuration that is incompatible with the computing platform is supported*" as recited in claim 63.

Additionally, *Brownwell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, *Brownwell* discloses a program for "'USB networking', connecting USB hosts as peers" (page 1, line 21). However, *Brownwell* fails to suggest "a first returning component configured to return a

remote network drive interface specification configuration that is **configured to operate with a computing platform from the network adapter**... [and] a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, **when there is an indication that an other configuration that is incompatible with the computing platform is supported**" as recited in claim 63.

Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Brownwell*. More specifically, *Moroz* discloses a "universal docking station for connecting a portable computer to a plurality of peripheral devices" (page 1, paragraph [0007]). However, this is completely different than "a first returning component configured to return a remote network drive interface specification configuration that is **configured to operate with a computing platform from the network adapter**... [and] a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, **when there is an indication that an other configuration that is incompatible with the computing platform is supported**" as recited in claim 63. For at least these reasons, claim 63 is allowable.

F.   Claim 68 is Allowable Over _Microsoft, Brownell,_ and _Moroz_

The Office Action indicates that claim 68 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of Non-Patent Literature from Brownell and Machek on USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Brownell* and *Moroz* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 68. More specifically, claim 68 recites:

> A system for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising:

23

a universal serial bus port configured to receive a network device according to *a first configuration that is configured to operate with a computing platform*;

a detecting component configured to detect the network device coupled to the universal serial bus port;

a first issuing component configured to issue a universal serial bus reset to the network device to reset the state of the network device;

a second issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration *the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*;

a third issuing component configured to issue a first descriptor request to retrieve device descriptors from the network device;

a receiving component configured to receive a device descriptor listing indicating its function from the network device; and

a fourth issuing component configured to issue configuration commands, whereby, the network device returns a list of descriptors, wherein in response to a determination ~~that~~ that at least one of the descriptors indicates multiple supported configurations, a second descriptor request is issued.
(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 68 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Brownell*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "system for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising… a universal serial bus port configured to receive a network device according to *a first configuration that is configured to operate with a computing platform*… [and] a second issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration *the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*" as recited in claim 68. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "[r]emote NDIS is a simple extension of well-understood and time-tested NDIS architecture" (page 1, line 43) and its use on a Windows® platform. However, nowhere does *Microsoft* suggest "a universal serial bus port configured to receive a network device according to *a first configuration that is configured to operate with a*

computing platform... [and] a second issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration *the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*" as recited in claim 68.

Additionally, *Brownwell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, *Brownwell* discloses a program for "'USB networking', connecting USB hosts as peers" (page 1, line 21). However, *Brownwell* fails to suggest "a universal serial bus port configured to receive a network device according to *a first configuration that is configured to operate with a computing platform...* [and] a second issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration *the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*" as recited in claim 68.

Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Brownwell*. More specifically, *Moroz* discloses a "universal docking station for connecting a portable computer to a plurality of peripheral devices" (page 1, paragraph [0007]). However, this is completely different than "a universal serial bus port configured to receive a network device according to *a first configuration that is configured to operate with a computing platform...* [and] a second issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration *the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform*" as recited in claim 68. For at least these reasons, claim 68 is allowable.

G. Claim 74 is Allowable Over *Microsoft, Brownell,* and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 74 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of Non-Patent Literature from

Brownell and Machek on USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*") and U.S. Publication Number

2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason

that *Microsoft* in view of *Brownell* and *Moroz* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the

elements of claim 74. More specifically, claim 74 recites:

> A computer-readable media containing a computer-executable program for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, the program comprising:
> one or more instructions for issuing a universal serial bus reset to the network device by the host, the network device operating to a first configuration, ***the first configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform***;
> one or more instructions for resetting the state of the network device;
> one or more instructions for enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, ***the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform***;
> one or more instructions for issuing by the host a first descriptor request enabling to retrieve device descriptors from the network device;
> one or more instructions for returning by the network device a computer code device descriptor indicating its function; and
> one or more instructions for issuing by the host configuration commands, whereby, the network device returns a list of descriptors, wherein in response to a determination ~~that~~ that at least one of the descriptors indicates multiple supported configurations, a second descriptor request is issued.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 74 is allowable over the cited art for at least the

reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Brownell*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses,

teaches, or suggests a "computer-readable media containing a computer-executable program

for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive

interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, the program comprising...

one or more instructions for issuing a universal serial bus reset to the network device by the

host, the network device operating to a first configuration, ***the first configuration being***

configured to operate with a computing platform... [and] one or more instructions for

enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, **the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform**" as recited in claim 74. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "[r]emote NDIS is a simple extension of well-understood and time-tested NDIS architecture" (page 1, line 43) and its use on a Windows® platform. However, nowhere does *Microsoft* suggest "one or more instructions for issuing a universal serial bus reset to the network device by the host, the network device operating to a first configuration, **the first configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform**... [and] one or more instructions for enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, **the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform**" as recited in claim 74.

Additionally, *Brownwell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, *Brownwell* discloses a program for "'USB networking', connecting USB hosts as peers" (page 1, line 21). However, *Brownwell* fails to suggest "one or more instructions for issuing a universal serial bus reset to the network device by the host, the network device operating to a first configuration, **the first configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform**... [and] one or more instructions for enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, **the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform**" as recited in claim 74.

Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Brownwell*. More specifically, *Moroz* discloses a "universal docking station for connecting a portable computer to a plurality of peripheral devices" (page 1, paragraph [0007]). However, this is completely different than "one or more instructions for issuing a universal serial bus reset to the network device by the host, the network device operating to a first configuration, **the first configuration being configured to operate with a computing platform**... [and] one or more instructions for enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second

configuration, ***the second configuration being incompatible with the computing platform***"
as recited in claim 74. For at least these reasons, claim 74 is allowable.

H.   <u>Claims 42 – 45, 47 – 51, 53 – 56, 58 – 62, 64 – 67, 69 – 73, and 75 – 78 are
Allowable Over *Microsoft, Brownell,* and *Moroz*</u>

The Office Action indicates that claims 42 – 45, 47 – 51, 53 – 56, 58 – 62, 64 – 67, 69 –
73, and 75 – 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over
Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows"
("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of Non-Patent Literature from Brownell and Machek on USB
Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*").
Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of
Brownell and *Moroz* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 42 – 45, 47
– 51, 53 – 56, 58 – 62, 64 – 67, 69 – 73, and 75 – 78. More specifically, dependent claims 42 –
45 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements
of allowable independent claim 41. Dependent claims 47 – 51 are allowable for at least the
reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim
46. Dependent claims 53 – 56 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend
from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 52. Dependent claims 58 – 62
are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of
allowable independent claim 57. Dependent claims 64 – 67 are allowable for at least the
reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim
63. Dependent claims 69 – 73 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend
from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 68. Further, dependent claims
75 – 78 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from and include the elements of
allowable independent claim 74. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*,
303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/afb/_____
Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
  HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway SE
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500